From: localreview
Sent: 15 September 2021 11:42
To: Planning Appeals
Subject: FW: FURTHER REPRESENTATION: Review of Application 20/01327/FUL - Land Adjacent to Carnlea, Main Street, Heiton TD5 8JR
Attachments: Driveway showing Craimar 1.jpg; Craimar 3.jpg; Craimar 2.jpg

Please could this e-mail and attached photos be added to the LRB site under the reference 20/01327/FUL and 21/00019/RREF

Regards Fiona

Fiona Henderson
Democratic Services Officer
Democratic Services
Resources
Council Headquarters
NEWTOWN ST BOSWELLS TD6 0SA
DDI : 01835 826502
fhenderson@scotborders.gov.uk

From: Gill Harrop [redacted]
Sent: 03 September 2021 15:54
To: localreview <localreview@scotborders.gov.uk>
Cc: Gillian Harrop [redacted]
Subject: FURTHER REPRESENTATION: Review of Application 20/01327/FUL - Land Adjacent to Carnlea, Main Street, Heiton TD5 8JR

CAUTION: External Email

Dear Sir or /and Madam,

We wish to provide further representation with regards to this review.

Whilst we initially welcomed the eventual inclusion of the revised plans to include a turning space, - it is quite clear from our practical experience of seeing visiting vehicles including delivery vans, an ambulance and more worryingly smaller cars trying to maneuver in what will be the intended allocated space and failing. It is obvious that this space is of insufficient size and this needs addressing. This point is referred to in the comments raised by the Roads Planning Officers 2nd response.

.....I refer to the amended site layout plan. I appreciate the effort to include a turning area for the private access, the lack of which was one of the reasons for refusal in my original consultation response. The location of the turning area will rely upon the use of the driveway for

Hillcrest being used when reversing out of the turning area, should gates or other obstruction be placed on the driveway for Hillcrest, then the turning area would no longer function. A solution to this would be to move the turning area East to approximately the midpoint of the site frontage, space could be freed up within the site by removing the internal turning area and simply having two nose-in parking spaces either side by side or nose to tail.

The above solution would remove my concerns with regards to the ability of vehicles to enter and exit the private access in a forward gear, however I would still be unable to support the proposal given the sub-standard access onto the public road. The access would have to be widened to 5.5m wide with 6m radii and visibility splays of 2.4m by 43m in either direction as well as being surfaced to my specification before I would be able to support this proposal. The land required to implement these improvements would appear to be out with the control of the applicant and as such I must continue to object.

The present 20mph speed restriction through the entire length of the A698 through Heiton village is regularly and consistently NOT adhered to, this is clear from the now installed speed indicator sign equipment. One only has to stand and watch vehicles speeding through the village. In fact the previous 30mph restriction, which at the end of the 18th month trial might be reinstated was also a great concern as vehicles regularly drove in excess of that limit.
Therefore these points should further endorse the need to have a visual splay as outlined in the Road Planning Officers report.
Sections 6 200 and 201 of the Highway Code relate to reversing and state:
200 Choose an appropriate place to manoeuvre. If you need to turn your vehicle around, wait until you find a safe place. Try not to reverse or turn round in a busy road; find a quiet side road or drive round a block of side streets.
201
Do not reverse from a side road into a main road. When using a driveway, reverse in and drive out if you can.

Whilst this is clearly not legislation it is advice which we and our neighbours all strongly suggest should be taken into regard with particular reference to the provision of an adequate turning space to ensure egress onto the A698 in a forwards direction.

Furthermore, we reiterate, along with the Roads planning Officer that the proposal does not comply with policy PMD2 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that it would be result in extra vehicular traffic on a sub-standard access to the detriment of road safety. If SBC have taken the necessary steps to write and subsequently implement their Local Development Plan 2016 with its policies, guidelines etc then these should be adhered to. If not then it calls into the question the very purpose and supposed reasoning behind having them.

Our property, Hillcrest has gates.

There is a mistake in the Planning Officers report which led to the decision to refuse the application. This has been pointed out to the Planning Officer who has subsequently stated '...that the immediate neighbouring building is not 1.5 storey in height, as I incorrectly identified.....'

Craimar is not 1 1/2 storey high as referred to in the report. And therefore the point raised in the 'Statement of Case' by Joe Nugent MRTPI of Brownshore Management, quoting the Planning Officers report should not be relied upon or taken into consideration. Photographs attached show this property. We wish again to highlight our concerns regarding the height and design of the proposed bungalow. Whilst we acknowledge that was not a reason for refusal, we still feel strongly about this. The plain fact it is not within keeping of the immediate houses on this driveway, all of which are true single storey dwellings.

In summary:

1. If you are to allow this appeal we strongly request that the turning space as drawn in the plans be revised and conditions be attached. What has been proposed is of insufficient specification and unfit for purpose. As such this could result in vehicles being forced into making the dangerous maneuver of reversing onto the A698.
2. The Local Development Plan 2016 rules which apply now should be followed. What was or wasn't applicable in 2004, 1994, 1952 or 1948 should be treated as irrelevant.
3. The Planning Officers report regarding the height of the opposite house, Craimar, are incorrect. This was pointed out at the time of the report being uploaded onto the Planning Portal and being live - June 2021 and subsequently. The proposed planned building is out of character with the 4 dwellings on this cul -de-sac as they are all true single storey bungalows.

As per our comments above. The present decision to refuse the application should be upheld. Or at the very least, stringent conditions attached which address the above points.

Yours respectfully,

Gill and Mark Harrop
Hillcrest, Main Street, Heiton.


CRAIGMAR
27